UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.	
09/505,619	02/16/2000	Ronald A. Katz	PAT-009B	6020	
29129 MICHELLE, A.	7590 04/02/2007 7 A RINELLI		EXAM	INER	
C/O WEST CORPORATION			GARG, YOGESH C		
11808 MIRAC MAIL STOP: V	LE HILLS DR. W11-LEGAL	•	ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER	
OMAHA, NE 6	58154	3625			
		•			
			MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE	
			04/02/2007	PAPER	

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Advisory Action Before the Filing of an Appeal Brief

Application No.	Applicant(s)	
09/505,619	KATZ ET AL.	
Examiner	Art Unit	
Yogesh C. Garg	3625	

	Yogesh C. Garg	3625	
The MAILING DATE of this communication appe	ars on the cover sheet with the	correspondence add	ress
THE REPLY FILED 06 March 2007 FAILS TO PLACE THIS AP	PLICATION IN CONDITION FOR	ALLOWANCE.	
 The reply was filed after a final rejection, but prior to or on this application, applicant must timely file one of the follow places the application in condition for allowance; (2) a No a Request for Continued Examination (RCE) in compliance time periods: The period for reply expires 3 months from the mailing date b) 	wing replies: (1) an amendment, af tice of Appeal (with appeal fee) in ce with 37 CFR 1.114. The reply m	fidavit, or other evider compliance with 37 C ust be filed within one	nce, which FR 41.31; or (3) of the following
no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire to Examiner Note: If box 1 is checked, check either box (a) or TWO MONTHS OF THE FINAL REJECTION. See MPEP 7	(b). ONLY CHECK BOX (b) WHEN TH	-	
Extensions of time may be obtained under 37 CFR 1.136(a). The date have been filed is the date for purposes of determining the period of ex under 37 CFR 1.17(a) is calculated from: (1) the expiration date of the set forth in (b) above, if checked. Any reply received by the Office later may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b) NOTICE OF APPEAL	tension and the corresponding amount shortened statutory period for reply orig r than three months after the mailing da	of the fee. The appropri inally set in the final Offi	iate extension fee ce action; or (2) as
 The Notice of Appeal was filed on A brief in comp filing the Notice of Appeal (37 CFR 41.37(a)), or any exter a Notice of Appeal has been filed, any reply must be filed 	nsion thereof (37 CFR 41.37(e)), to	avoid dismissal of th	ns of the date of e appeal. Since
AMENDMENTS 3. The proposed amendment(s) filed after a final rejection, (a) They raise new issues that would require further co (b) They raise the issue of new matter (see NOTE belo (c) They are not deemed to place the application in bel appeal; and/or	nsideration and/or search (see NO w);	TE below);	
(d) ☐ They present additional claims without canceling a NOTE: <u>See Continuation Sheet</u> . (See 37 CFR 1.1		ected claims.	
 The amendments are not in compliance with 37 CFR 1.1. Applicant's reply has overcome the following rejection(s) 		empliant Amendment	(PTOL-324).
 Newly proposed or amended claim(s) would be al non-allowable claim(s). 	·	•	
7. For purposes of appeal, the proposed amendment(s): a) how the new or amended claims would be rejected is protected. The status of the claim(s) is (or will be) as follows: Claim(s) allowed: Claim(s) objected to: Claim(s) rejected: Claim(s) withdrawn from consideration:		II be entered and an e	explanation of
AFFIDAVIT OR OTHER EVIDENCE	,		
 The affidavit or other evidence filed after a final action, bu because applicant failed to provide a showing of good and was not earlier presented. See 37 CFR 1.116(e). 			
9. The affidavit or other evidence filed after the date of filing entered because the affidavit or other evidence failed to of showing a good and sufficient reasons why it is necessary	overcome <u>all</u> rejections under appe y and was not earlier presented. S	al and/or appellant fai see 37 CFR 41.33(d)(ls to provide a l).
 The affidavit or other evidence is entered. An explanation REQUEST FOR RECONSIDERATION/OTHER 	n of the status of the claims after e	ntry is below or attach	ned.
 The request for reconsideration has been considered bu <u>See Continuation Sheet.</u> 	t does NOT place the application i	n condition for allowar	nce because:
12. ☐ Note the attached Information Disclosure Statement(s).13. ☐ Other:	(PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s)	ahra	
		Yogesh C Garg Primary Examiner	

Art Unit: 3625

Application No. 09/505,619

Continuation Sheet (PTO-303)

Continuation of 3. NOTE: Limitation in the currently amended independent claim 172, "the upsell is successful in providing the customer with the second good or service in repalcement thereof" raise new issues that would require further consideration and/or search..

Continuation of 11. does NOT place the application in condition for allowance because: (a). Due to current amendment as stated above it raises new issues, (b) the applicant has not responded to the rejection of claim 174 under 35 USC 112, first paragraph in the final action mailed on 12/6/2006, and (c) the current amendment does not overcome the rejection of claim 172 under 35 USC 112, first paragraph because "offering the second good or service to the to the prospective customer in lieu of the first good or service whereby the upsell serves to obviate the purpose for the primary transaction and the upsell is successful in providing the customer with the second good or service in replacement thereof" is new matter .

The applicant's provided support (see Remarks, pages 16-18) in the disclosure is directed to the following limitation: " offering a new product to the prospective customer in lieu of the requested service or repair whereby the upsell serves to obviate the purpose for the primary transaction and the upsell is successful in providing the customer with the new product in replacement thereof " and this is not the same as the currently added limitation recited in claim 172. The limitation in claim 172 is broader than the applicant's disclosure because it recites offering either a good or service in lieu of a requested service or good but, the disclosure does not disclose that offering a new service in lieu of a request of a product whereby the upsell serves to obviate the purpose for the primary transaction and the upsell is successful in providing the customer with the new service in replacement thereof.